

[COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 FITNESS ANYWHERE LLC,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 WOSS ENTERPRISES, LLC,
15 Defendant.

Case No. 5:14-cv-01725 BLF

**AMENDED JOINT PRETRIAL
STATEMENT AND ORDER**

Date: February 23, 2017
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Crtrm: 3, 5th Floor
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

1 Pursuant to the Court's Standing Order Re Final Pretrial Conference – Jury Trial, the
 2 parties submit the following Amended Joint Pretrial Statement and Order.
 3

4 **I. THE ACTION**

5 **A. The Parties**

6 The parties to this action are Plaintiff, Fitness Anywhere LLC (“TRX”), a Delaware
 7 limited liability company having its principal place of business in San Francisco, California, and
 8 Defendant, WOSS Enterprises, LLC (“WOSS”), a California limited liability company having its
 9 principal place of business in Antioch, California.

10 **B. Substance of the Action**

11 TRX asserts claims against WOSS for patent infringement, federal trademark
 12 infringement, federal and state unfair competition, and tortious interference with prospective
 13 economic relationships. *See* First Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 46). WOSS asserted a
 14 counterclaim that seeks declaratory judgment, that certain TRX patents are invalid, void and
 15 unenforceable.¹ *See* Defendant’s Second Amended Answer and Affirmative Defenses; First
 16 Amended Counterclaim (Dkt. No. 47).

17 The Court narrowed the scope of the action through its Order (1) Granting in Part and
 18 Denying in Part WOSS’s Motion for Summary Judgment (finding the 814 Patent invalid; the 197
 19 Patent not infringed; and independent claims 12 and 21 of the 896 Patent not infringed), and
 20 (2) Denying Fitness Anywhere’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and (3) Denying Fitness
 21 Anywhere’s Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. No. 149). At the Court’s direction, the
 22 parties have agreed to further reduce the claims and defenses they will assert at trial to the
 23 following:

24 **1. Patent Infringement**

25 TRX asserts that it is owner of all rights, title and interest in United States Patent No.

26 ¹ Previously, there were two additional patents-in-suit: U.S. Patent No. 7,806,814 (the “‘814
 27 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 8,043,197 (the “‘197 patent”). The Court ruled the ‘814 patent
 28 invalid (Dkt. No. 149) and the 197 Patent not infringed, and claims 12-25 of the ‘896 patent not
 infringed. *Id.*

1 7,044,896 (the “‘896 patent”) and that certain WOSS products infringe Claim 1 of the ‘896
 2 Patent, directly, through the doctrine of equivalents and/or by inducing or contributing to the
 3 infringement of another.

4 WOSS contends that the doctrine of equivalents is not an issue that Plaintiff is permitted
 5 to raise because neither Plaintiff ‘s PLR 3-1(c) Infringement Contentions nor the Infringement
 6 Contentions set forth in the report of its designated trial expert, Mr. Harvey Voris, relies on the
 7 doctrine of equivalents and that Plaintiff has never otherwise applied the doctrine of equivalents
 8 in connection with the 896 Patent. At his deposition, Mr. Voris said that his testimony at trial will
 9 not include any opinions not contained in his report. There is no discussion or opinion related to
 10 the doctrine of evidence to be found in his report.

11 TRX alleges the following WOSS products infringe the above-referenced claims of the
 12 ‘896 patent:

13 (1) the Titan 1 ½ in. Wide Strap;
 14 (2) the 3000 Equalizer;
 15 (3) the Military Gym Style (later renamed the ATTACK);
 16 (4) the Military 1 in. Trainer;
 17 (5) the Military 1 ½ in. Trainer;
 18 (6) the WOSS XT.

19 Collectively, products (1)-(6) are referenced below as the “Accused Products.” The
 20 parties have stipulated that one Accused Product—the Titan—may stand as a representative
 21 product for them all.²

22 WOSS contends that the Accused Products do not infringe independent Claim 1 of the
 23 ‘896, and thus also do not infringe dependent Claims 2-4 and 6-11. Specifically, WOSS contends
 24 that the Accused Products lack one or more elements specified in Claim 1. WOSS further asserts
 25

26 ² TRX contends that in the event the Court grants WOSS’s Motion *in Limine* #1 solely with
 27 respect to the Titan, the parties should select an alternative representative product. WOSS
 28 contends the Court’s ruling on WOSS’s Motion *in Limine* #1 should apply to all accused
 products.

1 that certain constructions of Claim 1 of the '896 patent, are impermissible as they would render
 2 Claim 1 invalid as being anticipated by (35 U.S.C. § 102), or obvious (35 U.S.C. § 103) in view
 3 of, the prior art patent 5,352,172 to Suzuki ("Suzuki patent"). WOSS does not otherwise assert
 4 that the '896 Patent is invalid.

5 **2. Trademark Infringement**

6 TRX asserts that it owns the registered trademark and service mark SUSPENSION
 7 TRAINING, as well as the registered trademark FITNESS ANYWHERE. TRX contends that
 8 WOSS has infringed TRX's federally registered marks in two ways. First, WOSS uses terms
 9 confusingly similar to SUSPENSION TRAINING, and second, WOSS uses SUSPENSION
 10 FITNESS, an expression confusingly similar to one or both of TRX's marks.

11 WOSS asserts that TRX does not own a federal registration for the words "suspension
 12 trainer" and does not assert any common law trademark rights in the words "suspension trainer."
 13 Defendant further asserts that TRX's mark SUSPENSION TRAINING is invalid because it is
 14 generic or merely descriptive and does not operate as a brand name to identify a single source;
 15 that FITNESS ANYWHERE and SUSPENSION FITNESS are not in the context of the market
 16 in which they are used, likely to cause confusion; to the extent WOSS uses the words "suspension
 17 trainer" or "suspension training," they are used to truthfully describe its own products to inform
 18 customers of the products it sells, and the uses of the products and not as a brand name, whereby
 19 WOSS's use falls easily in the protected area of classic "fair use". WOSS further contends that
 20 SUSPENSION FITNESS is not so similar to FITNESS ANYWHERE as to likely to cause
 21 confusion as to source, especially when viewed in the context of the fitness market and also
 22 because WOSS prominently displays its registered mark "WOSS" and its registered Winged Lion
 23 logo trademark in all of WOSS's ads and on its goods.

24 **3. Federal and State Unfair Competition**

25 TRX asserts that it owns the registered trademark and service mark SUSPENSION
 26 TRAINING, as well as the registered trademark FITNESS ANYWHERE. Plaintiff contends that
 27 WOSS has used confusingly similar imitations of TRX's federally registered marks and that such

1 use is likely to cause confusion, deception, and mistake by creating the false and misleading
 2 impression that WOSS's goods are manufactured or distributed by TRX, or are associated with
 3 TRX, or have sponsorship, endorsement, or approval of TRX. Additionally, TRX contends that
 4 WOSS has made false or deceptive statements regarding its own or TRX's products, including
 5 statements that (i) WOSS's products are "made in the USA" and (ii) advertising false
 6 "discounted" prices and artificial list prices. TRX contends that WOSS's actions constitute
 7 unfair competition under California law, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) and California
 8 Business and Professions Code § 17200 and are unlawful under California Business and
 9 Professions Code §§ 17501 and 17501.

10 WOSS asserts it has made no false or confusing statements that would cause confusion as
 11 to source, and that any damages are beyond speculative given the superior quality, dramatically
 12 lower price point of WOSS's goods, and the lack of any evidence that any sale was lost due to
 13 WOSS's use of the alleged trademark infringement, and the availability of other WOSS products
 14 and any one of a dozen third party substitutes at dramatically lower prices. WOSS also contends
 15 that any ads listing "discount prices" were not its ads but those of Amazon and that the WOSS
 16 ads on its own web pages do not include any mention of "discount prices". WOSS also contends
 17 that all of its products are manufactured in Antioch, California.

18 **4. Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**

19 TRX asserts that there exists an economic relationship between TRX and purchasers of
 20 exercise equipment and a probability of future economic benefit to TRX from these purchasers,
 21 and that WOSS has wrongfully acted to disrupt this relationship through misrepresentations to
 22 purchasers and violations of federal patent and trademark laws, and federal and state unfair
 23 competition laws.

24 WOSS asserts it has not committed, and TRX cannot prove, any interference claim as
 25 alleged because the intent requirement is lacking and because WOSS has committed no
 26 independent wrongful act that supports such a claim under California law. Moreover, damages
 27 from any such acts are speculative for the reasons set forth above. Any loss of Plaintiff's sales
 28

1 caused by WOSS was a result of fair and honest competition.
 2

3 **C. Relief Sought**

4 **1. By TRX**

5 TRX seeks damages, enhanced damages, punitive damages, costs, attorneys' fees,
 6 declaratory and injunctive relief as follows:

- 7 (a) A judgment that WOSS has infringed the '896 patent;
- 8 (b) A judgment that each Accused Product infringes the '896 patent;
- 9 (c) An order and judgment enjoining WOSS and its officers, directors, agents,
 10 servants, employees, affiliates, attorneys, and all others acting in privity or in concert with
 11 them, and their parents, subsidiaries, divisions, successors and assigns from further acts of
 12 infringement of the '896 patent;
- 13 (d) A judgment awarding TRX all damages adequate to compensate for
 14 WOSS's infringement of the '896 patent, including all pre-judgment and post-judgment
 15 interest at the maximum rate permitted by law;
- 16 (e) A judgment awarding TRX all damages, including treble damages, based
 17 on any infringement found to be willful, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, together with
 18 prejudgment interest;
- 19 (f) An order and judgment enjoining WOSS and its officers, directors, agents,
 20 servants, employees, affiliates, attorneys, and all others acting in privity or in concert with
 21 them, and their parents, subsidiaries, divisions, successors and assigns from further acts of
 22 misappropriation or infringement of the SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark and
 23 service mark;
- 24 (g) An order and judgment enjoining WOSS and its officers, directors, agents,
 25 servants, employees, affiliates, attorneys, and all others acting in privity or in concert with
 26 them, and their parents, subsidiaries, divisions, successors and assigns from further acts of
 27 misappropriation or infringement of the FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark;

(h) A judgment awarding TRX all damages adequate to compensate for WOSS's infringement of the SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark and service mark, including all pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted by law;

(i) A judgment awarding TRX all damages adequate to compensate for WOSS's infringement of the FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark, including all pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted by law

(j) A judgment awarding TRX its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1117;

(k) Restitutionary relief against WOSS and in favor of TRX, including disgorgement of wrongfully obtained profits and any other appropriate relief;

(l) A judgment that WOSS has violated 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) and enjoining WOSS from further violations of that law.

(m) A judgment that WOSS has violated California Business and Professions Code § 17200 and enjoining WOSS from further violations of that law.

(n) An accounting of WOSS's profits pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117;

(o) A judgment that WOSS tortiously interfered with TRX's prospective economic relationships;

(p) A judgment for exemplary and punitive damages;

(q) Any other remedy to which TRX may be entitled, including all remedies provided for in 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1116, 1117 and 1125(a), California Business and Professions Code § 17200, and under any other law

TRX further refers to the Expert Report of Kimberly Schenk (Dkt. No. 174-5), and submits herewith a copy of the Supplemental Expert Report of Kimberly Schenk (Dkt. No. 194-1), which further set forth TRX's alleged damages. WOSS asserts the "supplemental report" is improper and contains nothing but legal argument.

1 **2. By WOSS**

2 (a) That Plaintiff be denied all relief it has requested;

3 (b) That none of the Accused Products infringe Claim 1 of the '896 Patent;

4 (c) That any patent infringement found by WOSS was not willful;

5 (d) That Claim 1 must be construed to exclude a rigid support on which the
6 “elongated member” is supported and passes through in order not to be anticipated by the
7 prior art Suzuki patent;8 (e) That the words “suspension trainer” are merely descriptive of a type of
9 fitness trainer and are not used by WOSS as a source identifier (brand name) but rather as
10 a product descriptor and therefore do not infringe any trademark rights of Plaintiff;11 (f) That the mark SUSPENSION FITNESS is not likely when and as used by
12 WOSS to cause confusion as to source with the mark FITNESS ANYWHERE.13 (g) That any trademark infringement by WOSS was not intentional or willful
14 or egregious, or with the knowledge that such imitation is intended to be used to cause
15 confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive. 15 U.S.C. §1114(b).16 **D. Federal Jurisdiction and Venue**17 The parties agree that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all claims and
18 counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338 and 1367 and 15 U.S.C. § 1121. The parties
19 further agree that venue is appropriate because both parties are located and conduct business
20 within the State of California and within this judicial district.21 **II. FACTUAL BASIS OF THE ACTION**22 **A. Undisputed Facts**23 1. TRX is a Delaware limited liability company, and its principal place of
24 business is in San Francisco, California.25 2. WOSS is a California limited liability company, and its principal place of
26 business is in Antioch, California.

27 3. Venue is proper in this District.

1 4. The Court has personal jurisdiction over each of the parties, and each of
 2 them transact business within this District.

3 5. U.S. Patent No. 7,044,896, entitled "EXERCISE DEVICE INCLUDING
 4 ADJUSTABLE, INELASTIC STRAPS," was issued on May 16, 2006 to Randal A.
 5 Hetrick.

6 6. TRX owns, by assignment, the entire right, title, and interest in and to the
 7 '896 Patent.

8 7. TRX owns a federal trademark registration, Reg. No. 3,255,160, issued by
 9 the United States Patent and Trademark Office on June 26, 2007, for the trademark
 10 SUSPENSION TRAINING.

11 8. TRX owns a federal service mark registration, Reg. No. 3,255,161, issued
 12 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on June 26, 2007, for the service mark
 13 SUSPENSION TRAINING.

14 9. TRX owns a federal trademark registration, Reg. No. 2,975,844, issued by
 15 the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 26, 2005, for the trademark
 16 FITNESS ANYWHERE.

17 10. TRX's federally registered SUSPENSION TRAINING and FITNESS
 18 ANYWHERE marks are incontestable under 15 U.S.C. § 1065.

19 11. WOSS filed an application to register the mark SUSPENSION FITNESS
 20 on November 20, 2014 as actual use. The mark was filed in International Class 028 for
 21 manually-operated exercise equipment. The application was rejected on the grounds that
 22 the mark is merely descriptive of a certain kind of exercise equipment, if not generic and
 23 WOSS abandoned the application.

24 12. WOSS's first use of SUSPENSION FITNESS in commerce was on
 25 October 19, 2014.

26 13. TRX and WOSS compete in the fitness industry in connection with certain
 27 physical training devices.

1 14. WOSS sells or has sold the following products (“Accused Products”):

2 (a) the Titan 1 ½ in. Wide Strap;

3 (b) the 3000 Equalizer;

4 (c) the Military Gym Style (later renamed the ATTACK);

5 (d) the Military 1 in. Trainer;

6 (e) the Military 1 ½ in. Trainer; and

7 (f) the WOSS XT.

8 15. WOSS sells or has sold other physical trainers which Plaintiff has not
9 accused of infringement.

10 16. Each of the Accused Products is made, used, sold and/or offered for sale in
11 the United States.

12 17. Each of the Accused Products is offered for sale via WOSS’s website and
13 on Amazon.com and has been offered for sale through these websites years before and
14 during the course of this litigation.

15 18. On March 21, 2014, TRX sent and WOSS received a cease-and-desist
16 letter which included copies of three TRX Patents (7,044,896; 7,806,814; and 8,043,197)
17 and the certificates of registration for U.S. Trademark Reg. Nos. 3,255,160 and 3,255,161.

18 19. WOSS responded to the cease and desist letter.

19 20. TRX never provided WOSS with consent to make use of the alleged
20 invention claimed in the ’896 Patent.

21 21. Claim 1 of the ’896 patent reads as follows:

22 An adjustable, inelastic exercise device comprising: an elongated member having a
23 pair of ends separated by a length and a mechanism for adjusting said length,
24 where said elongated member is a substantially inelastic flat strap and, where said
25 pair of ends includes a first end having a first grip and a second end having a
26 second grip; and an anchor having a first portion for mounting to a structure and a
27 second portion including a flexible portion to support said elongated member at a
28 position along said length when both of said grips are pulled in a direction away
 from said anchor, wherein said flexible portion includes a loop, and wherein said
 elongated member passes through said loop.

1 22. Each of the underlined terms from Claim 1 of the '896 patent are found in
 2 each of the Accused Products:

3 An adjustable, inelastic exercise device comprising: an elongated member having a
 4 pair of ends separated by a length and a mechanism for adjusting said length,
 5 where said elongated member is a substantially inelastic flat strap and, where said
 6 pair of ends includes a first end having a first grip and a second end having a
 7 second grip; and an anchor having a first portion for mounting to a structure and a
 8 second portion including a flexible portion to support said elongated member at a
 9 position along said length when both of said grips are pulled in a direction away
 10 from said anchor, wherein said flexible portion includes a loop, and wherein said
 11 elongated member passes through said loop.

12 23. Although the Accused Products differ in certain respects, the portion of the
 13 products relevant to the patent infringement claim is identical (i.e., any sample Accused
 14 Product can be representative of all Accused Products at trial for purposes of analyzing
 15 infringement/non-infringement of Claim 1 of the '896 patent). The parties have agreed
 16 that the WOSS Titan Trainer can act as a representative accused product.

17 **B. Disputed Facts**

18 1. Whether WOSS, through selling the Accused Products, infringes claim 1-4
 19 and 6-11 of the '896 Patent, directly (whether each and every limitation in claim 1 of the
 20 '896 patent is found in the accused products) or through the doctrine of equivalents (35
 21 U.S.C. § 271);³

22 2. Whether WOSS induced another to infringe claims 1-4 and 6-11 of the
 23 '896 Patent (35 U.S.C. § 271).⁴

24 3. Whether WOSS has contributed to infringement by another of claims 1-4
 25 and 6-11 of the '896 Patent (35 U.S.C. § 271).

26 4a. Whether the Accused Products have: "a mechanism for adjusting said
 27 length , a first end having a first grip," and "a second end having a second grip; including
 28 a flexible portion to support said elongated member at a position along said length when

³ WOSS contends the doctrine of equivalents is not an issue that Plaintiff is permitted to raise.
 See footnote 2.

⁴ WOSS submits that neither induced infringement nor contributory infringement will be an issue at trial because WOSS will not defend based on the fact that the accused products are delivered to customers with the components only partially assembled.

1 both of said grips are pulled in a direction away from said anchor, a loop, wherein said
 2 elongated member passes through said loop.”

3 4b. Whether the Accused Products have: “a mechanism for adjusting said
 4 length [of said elongated member], a first end [of said elongated member] having a first
 5 grip,” and “a second end [of said elongated member] having a second grip; including a
 6 flexible portion to support said elongated member at a position along said length [of said
 7 elongated member] when both of said grips are pulled in a direction away from said
 8 anchor, a loop, wherein said elongated member passes through said loop.”

9 5. If WOSS is found to have infringed the ‘896 patent, whether its
 10 infringement was willful.

11 6. Whether WOSS infringed TRX’s SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark
 12 and service mark.

13 7. Whether WOSS infringed TRX’s FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark, or a
 14 combination of SUSPENSION TRAINING and FITNESS ANYWHERE.⁵

15 8. Whether WOSS has used words confusingly similar to TRX’s federally
 16 registered marks and that such use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to
 17 deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person,
 18 or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods, services, or commercial
 19 activities by another person (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a); California Business and Professions
 20 Code § 17200).

21 9. Whether WOSS’s use of the words “suspension trainer” are permitted by
 22 law under the doctrine of fair use.

23 10. Whether WOSS’s use of the words “suspension training” are permitted by
 24 law under the doctrine of fair use.

25
 26
 27
 28 ⁵ WOSS contends one cannot be liable for infringement of a combination of marks.

1 11. Whether TRX's SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark and service mark
 2 are valid (15 U.S.C. §§ 1057, 1065 and 1115); Whether TRX's SUSPENSION
 3 TRAINING trademark and service mark are merely descriptive;

4 12. Whether TRX's FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark is valid (15 U.S.C. §§
 5 1057, 1065 and 1115);

6 13. Whether, if WOSS infringed TRX's SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark
 7 and service mark, such infringement was intentional (15 U.S.C. § 1117);

8 14. Whether, if WOSS infringed TRX's FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark,
 9 such infringement was intentional (15 U.S.C. § 1117);

10 15. Whether, if WOSS infringed TRX's SUSPENSION TRAINING trademark
 11 and service mark, such infringement was willful or egregious, or with the knowledge that
 12 such imitation is intended to be used to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to
 13 deceive. (15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(b)).

14 16. Whether, if WOSS infringed TRX's FITNESS ANYWHERE trademark
 15 and service mark, such infringement was willful or egregious, or with the knowledge that
 16 such imitation is intended to be used to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to
 17 deceive. (15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(b)).

18 17. Whether WOSS made a false statement of fact in a commercial
 19 advertisement about its own or TRX's product (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1) (B); *Skydive*
 20 *Arizona, Inc. v. Quattrocchi*, 673 F.3d 1105, 1110 (9th Cir. 2012));

21 18. Whether, if WOSS made a false statement(s) of fact, they actually
 22 deceived or had the tendency to deceive a substantial segment of the statement's audience
 23 (*Id.*);

24 19. Whether, if WOSS made a false statement of fact, the deception is
 25 material, in that it is likely to influence the purchasing decision of its audience (*Id.*);

26 20. Whether, if WOSS made a false statement of fact, WOSS caused its false
 27 statement to enter interstate commerce (*Id.*);

1 21. Whether, if WOSS made a false statement of fact, TRX has been or is
 2 likely to be injured as a result of the false statement, either by direct diversion of sales
 3 from itself to WOSS or by a lessening of the goodwill associated with its products (*Id.*);
 4 22. Whether WOSS acted unlawfully in violation of California Business and
 5 Professions Code § 17533.7 (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200; *Kwikset Corp. v. Superior*
 6 *Court*, 51 Cal.4th 310, 322 (2011));
 7 23. Whether WOSS acted unlawfully in violation of California Business and
 8 Professions Code § 17501 (*Id.*);
 9 24. Whether there was a probable economic relationship between TRX and
 10 purchasers of exercise equipment. (California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI) 2202; *Youst*
 11 *v. Longo* 43 Cal.3d 64, 71, fn. 6 (1987));
 12 25. Whether, if there was an probable economic relationship between TRX and
 13 purchasers of exercise equipment, WOSS knew of, intended to, and in fact disrupted the
 14 relationship by means other than fair competition (*Id.*);
 15 26. Whether WOSS made misrepresentations of fact to prospective customers
 16 of TRX (*Id.*);
 17 27. Whether WOSS disrupted an economic relationship between TRX and
 18 purchasers of exercise equipment that resulted in harm to TRX (*Id.*);
 19 28. Whether WOSS's wrongful conduct, if any, was a substantial factor in
 20 causing harm to TRX (*Id.*);
 21 29. The amount of damages, if any, to which TRX is entitled.

22 **III. DISPUTED LEGAL ISSUES**

23 1. Whether, if WOSS infringed the '896 patent, such infringement was willful
 24 (35 U.S.C. § 284);
 25 2. The remedies, if any, to which TRX is entitled (*Id.*; 35 U.S.C. § 284, 287;
 26 15 U.S.C. § 1111, 1117).

1 3. Whether WOSS is entitled to an award of attorney fees for prevailing on
 2 Summary Judgment that the '814 patent is invalid, that the '197 patent is not infringed and
 3 that Claims 12 – 25 of the '896 Patent are not infringed, and if so in what amount.

4 4. Whether, if WOSS is found liable for patent infringement, this case is
 5 exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285, such that TRX is entitled to its reasonable attorneys'
 6 fees.

7 5. Whether the scope of Claim 1 of the '896 patent must be construed to
 8 exclude a rigid support for an elongated member.⁶

9 6. Whether two linked rigid rings can be construed as a "flexible portion" of
 10 an anchor to support an elongated member at a position along said length when both of
 11 said grips are pulled in a direction away from said anchor as called for in claim 1 of the
 12 '896 patent.

13 7. Whether the scope of claim 1 of the '896 patent must be construed to
 14 exclude a rigid loop on which an elongated member is supported.

15 **IV. ESTIMATE OF TRIAL TIME**

16 The Court originally set aside eight (8) days for trial. In view of the Court's rulings and the
 17 parties' streamlining of issues to be tried, it is now estimated trial will take 4-6 days.

18 **V. TRIAL ALTERNATIVES AND OPTIONS**

19 **A. Settlement Discussions**

20 The parties participated in a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Spero on July
 21 11, 2016. Per the Court's Standing Order, counsel for the parties further discussed settlement on
 22 September 8, 2016 as part of their pretrial meet and confer. The parties have been unable to reach

24 6 TRX contends that Paragraphs 5-7 of this section are not disputed legal issues; rather, that the
 25 Court has already definitively ruled on claim construction matters. *See Plaintiff's Motion in*
 26 *Limine # 4* (Dkt. No. 172). WOSS contends that while the court should not lightly, of course, alter
 27 rulings, the court is free to do so and has the power and discretion to do so at any time for any
 28 appropriate reason. *Amarel v. Connell*, 102 F.3d 1494, 1515 (9th Cir 1997) (" the interlocutory
 29 orders and rulings made pre-trial by a district judge are subject to modification by the district
 30 judge at any time prior to final judgment. . . .").

1 a settlement and do not presently believe further settlement discussions will be worthwhile.
 2

3 **B. Amendments or Dismissals**

4 WOSS has stipulated that it will not directly challenge the validity of the '896 patent other
 5 than to show that Claim 1 would be invalid under certain constructions of claim 1.⁷ (ECF 178.)
 6 Per that stipulation, WOSS has dismissed its counterclaim that the '896 Patent is invalid. The
 7 parties have no other amendments or dismissals of claims, however, the parties have agreed that
 8 the number of Accused Products is only 6 and that, as to the issue of infringement of Claim 1 of
 9 the '896 Patent, the issues are the same for all Accused Products so the Patent case can be tried by
 10 a representative Accused Product, the result of which can be applied to the other Accused
 11 Products. The Parties have further stipulated that, with the Court's permission, exhibits can be
 12 marked with labels of the same color and that any document can be offered, subject to any
 13 appropriate objection by either party.

14 **C. Bifurcation or Separate Trial of Issues**

15 Defendant believes that the a separate trial of issues or order of proof (not bifurcation)
 16 could result in a significant savings in court time. The evidence Plaintiff must present at trial falls
 17 into three major categories: (1) patent infringement; (2) trademark infringement; and, (3)
 18 damages. Should Plaintiff's damage expert survive a Daubert challenge as presented in
 19 Defendant's MIL #3 (Doc#163), the damage evidence will be extremely technical, lengthy and
 20 tedious, but will be significantly reduced if not eliminated altogether if Plaintiff cannot produce
 21 sufficient evidence to get to the jury on either or both liability issues. Because, there is a real
 22 possibility of a directed verdict at the close of Plaintiff's case, Defendant requests that the Court,
 23 pursuant to FRE611(a) and its inherent power, order the introduction of evidence as follows:

24

 25 ⁷ Plaintiff contends the Court has already definitively ruled on claim construction matters and
 26 validity of the '896 patent is not at issue in trial. *See Plaintiff's Motion in Limine # 4* (Dkt. No.
 27 172). WOSS contends that while the court should not lightly, of course, alter rulings, the court is
 28 free to do so and has the power and discretion to do so at any time for any appropriate reason.
Amarel v. Connell, 102 F.3d 1494, 1515 (9th Cir 1997) (" the interlocutory orders and rulings
 made pre-trial by a district judge are subject to modification by the district judge at any time prior
 to final judgment. . . .").

1 Plaintiff submit its liability case for patent infringement and trademark infringement before it puts
 2 on any damage evidence; the Court consider and decide Defendant's motions for directed verdicts
 3 after Plaintiff rests its liability case. It could also greatly reduce the trial time if the Court would
 4 hold a Daubert hearing before trial to determine if the "gate should be closed" on Ms. Schenk for
 5 not adhering to accepted methodologies and for employing unsupported assumptions. See
 6 Defendant's MIL # 4.

7 Plaintiff proffers bifurcation (or separate trials) is not appropriate in this case. "In the
 8 Ninth Circuit, [b]ifurcation . . . is the exception rather than the rule of normal trial procedure."
 9 *GEM Acquisitionco, LLC v. Sorenson Grp. Holdings, LLC*, No. C 09-01484 SI, 2010 WL
 10 1729400, at *3 (N.D. Cal. April 27, 2010) (citations omitted). "The party requesting bifurcation
 11 has the burden to prove that it is warranted in that particular case." *Id.* (citing *Spectra-Physics*
 12 *Lasers, Inc. v. Uniphase Corp.*, 144 F.R.D. 99, 102 (N.D. Cal. 1992)). Defendant has not met its
 13 burden.

14 Defendant's arguments for bifurcation are (i) Defendant's own self serving statements
 15 regarding its likelihood of success in this case and (ii) Defendant's contention that the damage
 16 evidence will be lengthy and tedious. Defendant's self serving statements are immaterial to the
 17 issue of bifurcation, and Defendant's contention regarding the time it would take to address issues
 18 of damages is not supported by facts. Indeed, TRX anticipates the damages portion of its case
 19 will take only 1-2 days. The amount of time required to address damages will depend, in part, on
 20 WOSS's cross examination of TRX's damages expert and the extent to which it challenges the
 21 assumptions of the expert; however, in large measure, TRX's damage analysis relies on WOSS's
 22 own financials, the authenticity and accuracy of which should not be at issue in this case.
 23 Bifurcation would require the parties to recall witnesses who have knowledge of issues pertaining
 24 to both liability and damages. It may also require duplicative testimony on issues such as how
 25 WOSS came to develop its products and marketing, which may be relevant to both liability and
 26 damages (e.g., willfulness). In sum, bifurcation will not result in judicial economy, but is likely
 27 to actually lengthen proceedings and the Court should deny Defendant's request.

1 **D. Binding Effect of the Joint Pretrial Statement and Order**

2 *The foregoing admissions having been made by the parties, and the parties having*
 3 *specified the foregoing issues of fact and law remaining to be litigated, this order shall*
 4 *supplement the pleadings and govern the course of trial of this action, unless modified to prevent*
 5 *manifest injustice.*

6 Dated: February 16, 2017

7

8

9 /s/ H. Michael Brucker
 10 H. Michael Brucker Law Corp.
 11 H. Michael Brucker
 12 michael@hmlawoffice.com
 13 5855 Doyle Street, Suite 110
 14 Emeryville, CA 94608
 15 T: +1 (510) 654 6200

16

17 Steven M. Kipperman Law Corporation
 18 Steven M. Kipperman
 19 220 Montgomery St. Ste. 1077
 20 San Francisco, CA 94104
 21 T: +1 (415) 397-8600

22

23 Attorneys for Defendant
 24 WOSS Enterprises, LLC

25

26 /s/ Michael J. Waters
 27 VEDDER PRICE P.C.
 28 Alain Villeneuve (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 29 avilleneuve@vedderprice.com
 30 Michael J. Waters (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 31 mwaters@vedderprice.com
 32 222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
 33 Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003
 34 T: +1 (312) 609-7500
 35 F: +1 (312) 609-5005

36

37 Vedder Price (CA), LLP
 38 Heather M. Sager, Bar No. 186566
 39 hsager@vedderprice.com
 40 275 Battery Street, Suite 2464
 41 San Francisco, California 94111
 42 T: +1 (415) 749-9500
 43 F: +1 (415) 749-9502

44

45 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 46 FITNESS ANYWHERE LLC

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283</